— Control of vehicular pollution through promotion of clean fuels, introduction of stringent emission norms and fuel specifications.

— Control of noise pollution through various notifications such as fordiesel gensets, firecrackers and motor vehicles.

— City specific plans for improvement of environment.

— Strengthening the monitoring network and institutional capabilities to facilitate and improve enforcement mechanism.

Food consignment from US

371. SHRIRAJKUMARDHOOT:
SHRIMATI N.R DURGA:

Will the Minister of ENVIRONMENT AND FORESTS be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the Genetic Engineering Approval Committee of the Ministry, in December 2002, rejected US consignment of 1000 tonnes of Soya-Corn blend meant for making food for poor school children in India;

(b) if so, the reasons therefore;

(c) what is Government's policy to ensure all health checks for such imports;

(d) whether US has appealed to authority against the rejection; and

(e) if so, what has been the decision of the appellate authority?

THE MINISTER OF STATE INTHE MINISTRY OF ENVIRONMENT AND FORESTS (SHRI DILIP SINGH JUDEV): (a) and (b)The proposal of CARE & CRS to import Corn Soya Blend (CSB) containing genetically modified (GM) material under the Integrated Child Development Services (ICDS) program through United States Agency for International Development (USAID) was considered by the Genetic Engineering Approval Committee (GEAC) in its meeting held on 7th November 2002. The GEAC noted that there are several GM corn varieties being cultivated in USA both for human consumption and animal feed. In view of the apprehension expressed by ICMR and in the absence of any certification

from the US regulatory agency to the effect that the CSB shipment does not contain the banned or obsolete variety of transgenic corn, the GEAC decided not permit the import of CSB.

(c) All food items imported into the country are checked as per the provisions of the Prevention of Food Adulteration (PFA) Act and Rules. For food having GM content, the GEAC evaluates the food and health safety aspects prior to its import.

(d) and (e) The appeal was filed by the CARE and CRS before the Appellate Authority against the decision of the GEAC not to permit the import of CSB. The same was, withdrawn by them later.

Environmental clearance for projects

372. DR. VIJAY MALLYA: Will the Minister of ENVIRONMENT AND FORESTS be pleased to state:

(a) whether the proposal of Karnataka Government for release of 188.40 ha. of forestland in favour of Revenue Department for rehabilitation of Tribal families displaced from Bandipur National Park and construction of Kabini Reservoir is pending for environmental clearance, if so, the details thereof;

(b) if so, the reasons for delay in clearing the above project; and

(c) the details of other proposals of Government of Karnataka pending for environmental clearance?

THE MINISTER OF STATE INTHE MINISTRY OF ENVIRONMENT AND FORESTS (SHRI DILIP SINGH JUDEV): (a) and (b) For diversion of forest land for non-forestry uses, forestry clearance is granted under the provisions of the Forest (Conservation) Act, 1980.

The Central Government received such a proposal from Government of Karnataka on 14.7.2000 under the provisions of the Forest (Conservation) Act, 1980. The proposal was rejected as the land formed part of the Bandipur National Park. As per the directions of the National Human Rights Commission, the State Government has submitted a fresh proposal for diversion of 200.00 ha. of forest land for the purpose on 28.01.2003.